



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,811	02/08/2002	Yiqiong Wang	LIGHT1900-2 (LIGHT1901)	1062

25548 7590 04.23.2003

TERRANCE A. MEADOR  
GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH, LLP  
4365 EXECUTIVE DRIVE  
SUITE 1100  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121-2133

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

CULBERT, ROBERTS P

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1763

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/072,811	WANG, YIQIONG
Examiner	Art Unit	
Roberts Culbert	1763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                               | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5 &amp; 7</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION*****Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 2/10/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, applicant has argued that the Handa abstract indicates that the patent is directed to integrated optical devices, whereas the Wong and Deshmukh references are directed to etching of integrated circuits (ICs). The applicant concludes that because Wong does not teach that the etching method is suitable for use with optical components, there is no suggestion to combine the references.

The argument is not persuasive because the both the Wong and Deshmukh references teach the etching of silicon, a common material for optical device fabrication. Further, it is notoriously old and well known in the semiconductor fabrication art, that integrated circuits frequently are comprised of optical devices and related components. Evidence of this is provided in U.S. Patent 4,927,781 to Miller and U.S. Patent 4,956,682 to Ohnaka et al. No evidence is provided by applicant to support the assumption that the references exclude optical components by referring to integrated circuits.

Applicant has argued that there is no reasonable expectation of success because the Wong patent is directed to integrated circuit fabrication that produces smoothness several orders of magnitude less than is produced in waveguide formation.

The argument is not persuasive because no evidence is provided by applicant to show the cited difference in smoothness. No reference to smoothness is made in the Wong or Deshmukh references. Hence, they do not teach away from the formation of optical components. Furthermore, as stated above,

Art Unit: 1763

the term integrated circuit does not teach away from the formation of optical components, instead the term is inclusive of these devices as shown by the cited references to Miller and Ohnaka.

Applicant has argued that the variables of pressure, flowrates, and chemistry are not cause effective variables as shown by Wong. The argument is not persuasive. The Wong reference only teaches that it is difficult to reproduce characteristics such as profile and etch rate in the prior art given the large number of interrelated variables such as chemistry, pressure, and flow-rates. Note that the quotation cited by applicant appears in the background of the invention. It is clear from the experimental results in Tables 1-5 in Wong that the variables are cause effective as stated and may be optimized through routine experimentation. Further, Wong provides the ranges for the complicated, interrelated variables including the chemistry in the detailed description. The Wong reference also anticipates the claimed ranges for pressure and molar ratio. See Tables 1-5. Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. See MPEP 2144.05

Applicant has argued that the Kanno does not teach an etching medium that includes both SF<sub>6</sub> and C<sub>4</sub>F<sub>8</sub>. The argument is not persuasive because Kanno does suggest the combination. See Claim 16, for example. Note the etching gas includes "at least one member".

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-20, 22, and 25-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,776,661 to Handa in view of U.S. Patent 5,874,362 to Wong et al.

Art Unit: 1763

Handa teaches the formation of an optical waveguide (Column 9, Lines 67-68) and (Column 10, Lines 1-25). Handa teaches depositing glass on a substrate, forming a mask on the glass, and applying an etching medium to the glass. The ridge of the waveguide is formed including sides and facets. (Figure 15B.) Handa also shows the formation of a plurality of waveguides (Figure 11). Handa teaches the use of dry etching. Handa does not teach an etching medium including a fluorine-containing gas, and one or more partial passivants. Wong does teach the use of fluorinated gas mixtures for the purpose of etching glass using dry etching. Wong shows an etching mixture containing hydrogen bromide, silicon tetrafluoride, helium, and oxygen (Column 7, Lines 21-23). Wong also suggests the use of an etching medium including sulfur hexafluoride, and nitrogen trifluoride as etching gasses (Column 7, Lines 61-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the etching medium of Wong for the purpose of etching in the method of Handa in order to increase etch profile control and enhance mask selectivity as suggested by Wong.

Regarding claim 4, Wong also anticipates etching without the use of oxygen as suggested by the operating parameters summarized in Table 1. Wong shows an oxygen flow range of 0-10 sccm.

Claims 9-11, 15-17, 29, 30 and 33-35 differ from Handa in view of Wong by specifying various compositions and process conditions for the etching process such as pressure and molar ratio. A person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention would have found it obvious to modify Handa in view of Wong by using different processing parameters because same were known to be cause effective variables and routine experimentation would have been expected to optimize them. *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215.

Changes in temperature, concentrations, or other process conditions of an old process, do not impart patentability unless the recited changes are critical, i.e., they produce a new and unexpected result. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Regarding claim 19, as applied above, Handa in view of Wong discloses the method of the invention substantially as claimed, but Handa uses a photoresist mask. Handa does not show the use of an oxide mask. Wong teaches that an oxide mask is suitable for the purpose of forming a mask (Column

Art Unit: 1763

5, Lines 52-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use an oxide mask because it was known in the art at the time of invention to be a suitable method for forming a mask.

Regarding claim 28, as applied above, Handa in view of Wong discloses the method of the invention substantially as claimed, but does not teach obtaining the optical component from a supplier. The office takes official notice that obtaining starting materials from a supplier is well known in the art of semiconductor fabrication. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to obtain starting materials from a supplier to simplify the fabrication process.

Claims 2, 23, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,776,661 to Handa in view of U.S. Patent 6,235,214 to Deshmukh et al.

As applied above, Handa discloses the method of the invention substantially as claimed, but does not teach the use of an etch mixture containing trifluoromethane. Deshmukh shows a gas mixture containing sulfur hexafluoride, oxygen and trifluoromethane (Column 2, Lines 33-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the etching medium of Deshmukh for the purpose of etching in the method of Handa in order to increase etch rate and enhance mask selectivity as suggested by Deshmukh.

Claims 3, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,776,661 to in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0001652 to Kanno et al.

As applied above, Handa discloses the method of the invention substantially as claimed, but does not teach the use of an etch mixture containing C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>8</sub>. Kanno teaches that C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>8</sub>, CHF<sub>3</sub> and SF<sub>6</sub> are suitable etchants for the purpose of etching a semiconductor (Paragraph 57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the etching medium of Kanno for the purpose of etching in the method of Handa in order to improve the etch profile and enhance mask selectivity.

Claims 21 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,776,661 to Handa in view of U.S. Patent 5,853,960 to Tran et al.

Tran teaches a method for inductive coupled plasma etching of a glass lens (Column 8, Lines 24-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the inductive

Art Unit: 1763

coupled plasma method of Tran in the dry etching step of Handa because, as shown by Tran, the method of inductive coupled plasma is well known in the art, and provides a suitable method for dry etching.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-39 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-34 of copending Application No. 09/845,093 in view of U.S. Patent 6,235,214 to Deshmukh et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0001652 to Kanno et al., and U.S. Patent 5,853,960 to Tran et al. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the examined claims are either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over the reference claims in view of the prior art as applied above. See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985);

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-39 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-72 of copending Application No. 09/932,253 in view of U.S. Patent 5,874,362 to Wong et al., U.S. Patent 6,235,214 to Deshmukh et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0001652 to Kanno et al., and U.S. Patent 5,853,960 to Tran et al. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

Art Unit: 1763

the examined claims would have been obvious over the reference claims in view of the prior art as applied above. See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985);

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

**Conclusion**

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberts Culbert whose telephone number is (703) 305-7965. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Mills can be reached on (703) 308-1633. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

April 16, 2003

*Benjamin L. Utech*  
BENJAMIN L. UTECH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700